REMARKS

Claims 10-13 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have amended claims 10-13 overcome the rejection. Applicants respectfully request in light of this amendment that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 10-13 stand rejected under 35 USC §101, as the claims recite a use without any process steps. Applicants have amended claims 10-13 overcome the rejection. Applicants respectfully request in light of this amendment that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 1-5, and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 (e), as being anticipated by Alexander et al., US 5,731,450. Claims 1, 2 and 8 have been amended to clearly distinguish them over the prior art. Claims 3-5 have been cancelled. In light of this amendment applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 1-5, and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 (b), as being anticipated by Palinczar, US 4,699,779. Claims 1, 2 and 8 have been amended to clearly distinguish them over the prior art. Claims 3-5 have been cancelled. In light of this amendment applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 1-5, and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 (e), as being anticipated by Chaudhuri et al., US 5,736,128. Claims 1, 2 and 8 have been amended to clearly distinguish them over the prior art. Claims 3-5 have been cancelled. In light of this amendment applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 1-6, and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 (e), as being anticipated by Narayanan et al., US 5,597,574. Claims 1, 2 and 8 have been amended to clearly distinguish them over the prior art. Claims 3-6 have been cancelled. In light of this amendment applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 (e), as being anticipated by Duvel, US 5,945,093. Claims 1, 2 and 8 have been amended to clearly distinguish them over the prior art. Claims 3-7 have been cancelled. In light of this amendment applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 1-5, and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 (b), as being anticipated by Langer et al., US 5,243,021. Claims 1, 2 and 8 have been amended to clearly distinguish them over the prior art. Claims 3-5 have been cancelled. Applicants point out that the limitations of claim 6 have been added to claim 1, and as Claim 6 was not rejected, Claim 1 should now, further, be allowable over Langer. In light of this amendment applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 1-5, and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 (b), as being anticipated by Borgerding et al., US 4,215,004. Claims 1, 2 and 8 have been amended to clearly distinguish them over the prior art. Claims 3-5 have been cancelled. In light of this amendment applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 1-5, and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 (b), as being anticipated by Rek et al., US 5,731,450. Claims 1, 2 and 8 have been amended to clearly distinguish them over the prior art. Claims 3-5 have been cancelled. In light of this amendment applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 (a), as being obvious over Langer et al., US 5,243,021. Claims 1, 2 and 8-15 have been amended to clearly distinguish them over the prior art. Claims 3-7 have been cancelled. The amended claims should not be obvious from Langer, as this document does not address the special problem of dyeing in cheeses (see first page of the instant description). Langer only quite generally mentions that his compositions may be used in fabric care compositions and there is no example for treating of textiles. In light of this amendment applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

New claim 16 has been added. Support for new claim 16 can be found on page 14, lines 3-6 of the specification. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request allowance of new claim 16.

As the total number of claims does not exceed the number of claims originally paid for, no fee is believed due. However if an additional fee is required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any fee deficiency to Deposit Account No. 03-2060.

Entry of the above amendment is respectfully requested. The claims are fully supported by the specification.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott E. Hanf
Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 38,906

Customer Number 25,255

CLARIANT CORPORATION
INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
4000 Monroe Road.
Charlotte, NC 28205
(704) 331-7140
Fax (704) 331-7707